

Steelhead Recovery Team Meeting

July 23, 2014 Meeting Summary

10:00 am – 3:00 pm

7600 Sand Point Way NE, Seattle, WA 98115 | Building 2 - cafeteria conference room

v. 9-12-14

Decisions & Actions from the Meeting

Decision	Comments
1. Add a step to the revised description of the Stresses and Pressures task to evaluate the highest impact pressures ahead of prioritizing.	Ken Currens offered to be part of a subgroup for this task. He emphasized that it will be important to find a balance of scale for this DPS-level assessment.
2. For public outreach around Phase 1 products, the Team will consider formalizing a letter to the Recovery Council to lay out messages to watersheds.	
3. Use the recovery scenarios to create habitat goals.	According to NOAA's recovery planning guidance, habitat goals are required as part of threats criteria, but they need not be quantitative. The team can also set "interim targets" over a 10+ year timeframe for habitat goals, for example.

Action	Assignment
1. Start reviewing the Draft Recovery Plan Outline by the end of September.	Recovery team members
2. Provide examples of the Open Standards method to discuss at the next meeting.	Jacques White
3. Convene the Recovery Goals & Scenarios Subgroup to refine their development plan ahead of the next Team meeting.	Joe Anderson
4. Convene co-managers to discuss broad goals and incorporate appropriate process into the Recovery Goals & Scenarios Subgroup's development plan.	Elizabeth Babcock and Alison Agness are available to help convene this discussion.

Welcome & Introductions

Elizabeth Babcock welcomed the Recovery Team to the meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to (1) review status of the work plan, (2) discuss the Open Standards process, and (3) review progress and updates of the Recovery Goals and Scenarios Subgroup.

1. Review Status of Work Plan

A. Summary of Changes

- 1) Adopt task and timeline changes agreed from the last meeting
 - Shifted the DPS Monitoring and Evaluation plan to Phase 2 and extended the timeline of Phase 2 and 3
- 2) Revise the description of the Stresses and Pressures task
 - Ken Currens offered an additional a step to the revised description of the Stresses and Pressures task to evaluate the highest impact pressures ahead of prioritizing, and also offered to be part of the subgroup for this task. He emphasized that it will be important to find a balance of scale for this DPS-level assessment.
 - One member shared that the Hood Canal pilot project was able to identify significant information gaps in their pressure assessment, highlighting the need for adaptive management to fill critical gaps in knowledge, both in freshwater and marine environments. He stressed the importance of capturing this information.
- 3) Revise the timeline for Draft Recovery Plan Outline review
 - Recovery Team members can expect to start their reviews of the Draft Recovery Plan Outline by the end of September.
- 4) Refining subgroup membership for Phase 1 tasks
 - See below.
- 5) Adding milestones as opportunities for public outreach.
 - See below.

B. Status of Subgroup Membership and Convening Subgroups

Confirmed membership includes:

- 1) Recovery Goals and Scenarios Subgroup – Joe Anderson, Neala Kendall, Erik Neatherlin (WDFW); Jeff Hard (NWFSC); Ken Currens (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission); Ed Connor (Seattle City Light)
 - This subgroup is already meeting and work is underway. See progress update below.
- 2) Stresses and Pressures Subgroup – Tristan Peter-Contesse, Jeanette Dorner, Kari Stiles, Scott Redman (Puget Sound Partnership); Ed Connor, Scott Powell (Seattle City Light); Ned Currence (Nooksack Indian Tribe); Ken Currens (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission)
 - This subgroup will kick off soon.
- 3) Watershed Template Subgroup – Tristan Peter-Contesse, Jeanette Dorner (Puget Sound Partnership); Ed Connor, Scott Powell (Seattle City Light); Ned Currence (Nooksack Indian Tribe)
 - This subgroup will kick off soon.
 - Tristan and Jeanette will be liaisons to the Watershed Leads group and may pull in representative(s) from the West Sound to the subgroup, who has expressed interest.
 - Jacques White would like to offer the assistance of Susan O’Neil to the Watershed Template Subgroup, contingent on funding. They are working on a grant opportunity to support her participation and will keep us posted.

Subsequent Recovery Team meetings will present an opportunity for subgroups to provide progress updates to the full Team. All Recovery Team members play an important role for review of subgroup products and advising on subgroup progress.

C. Public Outreach Strategies for Phase 1 Products

We will have three milestones from Phase 1 products:

- 1) Draft Recovery Plan Outline ~ January 2015
- 2) Recovery Goals, Scenarios, and Delisting Criteria ~ January 2016
- 3) Stresses and Pressures and Template for Developing Watershed Recovery Plans ~ April 2016

Options for public outreach about these milestones include publishing products on NOAA's website for steelhead recovery planning, communications via the listserv, and hosting workshops.

The Team also discussed outreach interim to rolling out completed products, particularly for the recovery goals and scenarios work and the watershed template work. Tristan Peter-Contesse identified the opportunity to work with the Watershed Leads group to communicate interim progress on the watershed template, and Elizabeth Babcock, as well as other Team representatives to the Recovery Council will provide progress updates on the whole effort at Council meetings. The Team will continue to refine engagement plans for both efforts as the work gets underway.

Ken Currens identified the need to be clear about how this DPS-level work will inform watershed-level work, as the watershed-level process for Puget Sound steelhead recovery planning is currently undefined. This is a question coming up at Watershed Leads and Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission meetings lately. On a related note, Tristan Peter-Contesse offered to share a proposal from West Sound for gathering information to inform their steelhead planning. To address questions and aid with outreach, the Team will contemplate formalizing a letter to the Recovery Council to lay out messages to watersheds specifically around how the Team's watershed template work relates to watershed-level planning with interim recommendations.

2. Open Standards Review

A. Tristan Peter-Contesse led an introduction to Open Standards for the Practice of Conservation (Open Standards) and a discussion with the Team to explore questions about the Open Standards process and whether and how we use the process going forward.

B. Remaining Questions and Next Steps for Resolution:

- 1) *What are the alternatives?*

Integrated Ecosystem Assessment (IEA) is another strategic planning tool, but regardless of the tool selected you have to go through the same steps. There are pros and cons of any tool, but Open Standards was selected for Puget Sound Chinook because it was viewed to have the fewest disadvantages of the available tools.

- 2) *What are the disadvantages to using Open Standards?*

There is real value as an organizing tool, but it is built for visual people and it requires learning a method. Orientation can occur with a 1.5 day workshop and the Recovery Team, as a small group, could do this. Also, it was expensive the first time the process was used for Chinook. It would not be as expensive building from investments already made.

- 3) *Can we see examples of finished products that used this method?*

It would be helpful to see the differences between what the insiders'/planners' work looked like vs. what is conveyed to the public. Jacques White will follow up and provide examples, and we can discuss examples at the next meeting.

- 4) *From a technical perspective, we need to understand the links between flow charts, hypotheses, and technical information. Can we see those links?*

Yes, we can use examples to drill into the links and tee up discussion of methods specific to this project. Elizabeth Babcock and Alison Agness will work to frame up this discussion for the next meeting to inform the Team decision.

3. Recovery Goals & Scenarios Paper/Proposal

A. Progress Update

Joe Anderson provided an update on the subgroup's development plan for recovery goals and scenarios, which all subgroup members have reviewed. Joe Anderson is working to address comments from the subgroup members, before broader vetting with a technical community. Ahead of doing so, he identified two topics emerging from the subgroup comments for discussion by the Recovery Team today. Topic 1 – What is the relationship between goals and criteria? Topic 2 – What is the appropriate sequencing and scale of this effort?

B. Goals and Criteria Discussion

The Team discussed both delisting goals and broad sense goals in other NOAA salmon and steelhead recovery plans, and reviewed NOAA's recovery planning guidance on recovery goals and criteria. The team also reviewed NOAA's descriptions of recovery goal and criteria, the relationship between the two, and emphasized the sideboards of NOAA's requirements with three major points:

- 1) Broad sense goals are not held to the same standard as ESA requirements for delisting goals of objective, measurable criteria; an area of flexibility to discuss.

The Team discussed the history of goal development for Puget Sound Chinook. At a recent policy-level meeting of the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, Ken Currens asked if Tribes intend to engage as co-managers in setting broad sense goals for Puget Sound steelhead similar to previous efforts for Puget Sound Chinook (modeled MSY based on habitat conditions desired in the future) and the answer was yes. Ken recognized that co-managers need to figure out the process, but that from the Tribes perspective it would include quantifying harvestable surplus.

- 2) It is important to identify the difference between the ESA delisting goals and other goals in the recovery plan.

Again referencing the history of goal development for Puget Sound Chinook, the Team recalled that the independent modeling efforts used to quantify delisting goals and broad sense goals resulted in overlapping ranges for VSP targets, and as a result, the delisting and broad sense goals were compatible in the Puget Sound Chinook plan. This would not necessarily be the case for Puget Sound steelhead.

- 3) Delisting goals include two types of criteria: biological viability criteria and threats criteria (criteria for each of the 5 listing/delisting factors) that combined make up the ‘objective, measurable criteria’ required.

Jeanette Dorner and Jacques White identified a need for specific habitat goals. According to NOAA’s recovery planning guidance, habitat goals are required as part of threats criteria, but they need not be numeric to meet the measurable and objective requirement. Elizabeth Babcock pointed out that the recovery scenarios work could get at habitat goals, and Joe Anderson concurred. Jacques White suggested that without specific habitat goals, it is difficult to envision a future where steelhead are doing well. Elizabeth Babcock pointed out that we can also set “interim targets” over a 10+ year timeframe for habitat goals, for example.

C. Sequencing and Scale Discussion

The Team discussed sequencing as the current approach to start at the DPS scale operating on the order of populations ahead of drilling down to the reach-scale within watersheds. Sequencing is also about the focus of modeling work to identify both population-level vulnerability to loss and opportunity to gain, which will inform where to protect and restore at the watershed and population levels.

Ken Currens stated that prioritizing among populations may be controversial from the standpoint of resource allocation, with the perception that those first in line are always first in line. However, focusing modeling on populations most at risk of extinction as well as populations that provide the greatest recovery cost-benefit would be informative.

Jeff Hard described the viability criteria developed by the Puget Sound Steelhead Technical Review Team (PSSTRT) as generic, where there are several ways to get to DPS viability. For example, the criteria identify the proportion of populations to be viable, but do not specify which ones. Similarly, criteria identify the need for both summer and winter types, but do not specify which ones. He suggested the goals and scenarios subgroup could build from the PSSTRT’s work to develop more specific biological viability criteria.

D. Next Steps for Recovery Goals & Scenarios

Subgroup needs to:

- 1) Convene to refine their development plan ahead of the next Team meeting.
- 2) Convene co-managers to discuss above referenced broad sense goals and incorporate appropriate process into the subgroup’s development plan.
- 3) Elizabeth Babcock and Alison Agness are available to help convene the co-manager discussion.

Updates and Questions

A. Funding Strategy Update

Elizabeth Babcock gave an update on work in progress to develop a funding strategy for watershed-level planning work that would build from the Team’s watershed template. She

emphasized the need to refine our understanding of remaining technical resource needs as the scope of work for recovery goals and scenarios is further refined.

B. Information Sharing Questions

Alison Agness reviewed questions from team members about information sharing and the Team resolved to share future meeting summaries on NOAA's website in the spirit of open, transparent process.

Public Comments

No public comments were received at this meeting.

Attendees

Participant	Affiliation
Alison Agness	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Joe Anderson	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife
Elizabeth Babcock	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Ned Currence	Nooksack Tribe
Ken Currens	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Jeanette Dorner	Puget Sound Partnership
Jeff Hard	Northwest Fisheries Science Center of NOAA Fisheries
Neala Kendall	Washington Department of Fish & Wildlife (observer)
Steve Leider	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service
Paul McCollum	Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe (observer)
Randy McIntosh	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (observer)
Tristan Peter-Contesse	Puget Sound Partnership
Scott Powell	Seattle City Light
Rob Walton	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (observer)
Jacques White	Long Live the Kings
Amilee Wilson	NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service (observer)
Claire Turpel	Triangle Associates, Inc. (observer)